



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/047,047

01/15/2002

Hiroshi Matoba

15211

3504

23389

7590

12/23/2008

SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC

400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA

SUITE 300

GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

JONES, HEATHER RAE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/23/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/047,047

Applicant(s)

MATOBA ET AL.

Examiner

HEATHER R. JONES

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43, 46, 47, 49 and 50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-11, 13-23, 25, 27-38, 40-42, 46, 47 and 49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4, 12, 24, 26, 39, 43 and 50 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-846)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed September 29, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that they disagree with the assertion that Wood et al. teaches a master unit selecting a slave apparatus to record while the master unit is being used to watch and record a live show on another channel since the master unit was already recording a program at the same time, as claimed. The Examiner respectfully disagrees in part. Wood et al. discloses that if two digital VCRs are connected to each other, the two digital VCRs can recognize each other's presence and one digital VCR recognizes itself as the "master" and is connected to the television 18, and the other digital VCR recognizes itself as the "slave" (paragraph [0030]). Furthermore, the two digital VCRs present a single unified interface to the user, effectively allowing the user to use the two digital VCRs as if they were a single digital VCR with two tuners and the combined disk space of the two individual digital VCRs (paragraph [0030]). Wood et al. also discloses that the master selects the slave apparatus to record in paragraph [0067] while the master unit is being used to watch and record a live show on another channel and if the hard disk drive of the master unit is full, but there is space available on the slave's hard disk drive, then the master unit store the video stream from its current channel onto the slave's hard disk drive, thereby selecting a slave apparatus to record. Therefore, the master stops recording and

sends its recording to the slave. However, this was cited because the original argument from the amendment filed on February 11, 2008 was that Wood et al. fails to successively ask the slave apparatus about whether the slave apparatus is capable of recording the program and then instructing the slave apparatus which has sent the response to set the program for timer recording. Wood clearly shows this limitation by having the slave record the program that does not fit on the master as discussed above and therefore, Wood et al. meets the claimed limitations and the rejection is maintained. Regarding paragraph [0018] that the Applicant cited, Wood et al. points out that the VCRs can be run independently or in the master/slave setup, which is further explained in paragraph [0030]). Furthermore, Applicant cites paragraph [0094] and states that the recording the program on the slave is not an option. The reason that this is not an option is because the two VCRs are not connected in this example, but if they were connected then they would run as a single unit with two tuners and twice the recording space as one VCR.

The Applicant argues that the logic is flawed that it is well known in the art that with a master and slave operation communication is made between the two devices to see if and when they are available for recording because the devices can be controlled individually. Plus the well known in the art statement is not correct since it is a 102 rejection. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wood et al. discloses in paragraph [0018] that the user may control all connected audio and video devices using a simple, natural, and unified interface provided by the

digital VCR 10 and that alternatively, the remote control 22 can, for example, send commands such as fast forward and rewind directly to the VCR 15. However, as in paragraph [0018] and paragraph [0030] it states that when the two devices are connected they are controlled as a single unified unit. Therefore, when they are not connected then they can be controlled independently and directly. When they are connected the master unit is the main interface and any commands meant for the slave will be sent to the slave device, thereby the master would be communicating with the slave. Furthermore, the language of this information being well known is not used in the actual rejection, but only in the arguments. Therefore, Wood et al. meets the claimed limitations and the rejection is maintained.

The Applicant argues that Wood et al. fails to disclose controlling the slave apparatus which has recorded the program to play back the program. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wood et al. discloses in paragraphs [0083] a list being displayed to show the recordings saved on the device or devices if they are connected into a master/slave connection. When the devices are connected together they act as one unified unit and the user can see a list of the combined recordings. Therefore, if the recording that is selected is from the slave device then the slave apparatus would play back the recording and if the recording was stored in the master apparatus then the master apparatus would playback the program. The memory and decoder for each VCR is displayed in Fig. 2 - each device is the same so they both include all the components of Fig. 2.

Furthermore, paragraph [0006] explains the advantages of having one unified interface for multiple devices. Therefore, Wood et al. meets the claimed limitations and the rejection is maintained.

The Applicant argues that Wood et al. fails to disclose that the master apparatus has means for, if instructed to start recording a program without setting timer recording therefor, instructing a slave apparatus which has not recorded programs so far and whose period of time up to the recording start time of a first program set for timer recording is the longest, to start recording the program, and wherein each of said slave apparatus has means for, if instructed to start recording a program, immediately starting to record said program. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wood et al. discloses in paragraph [0067] determining if the slave apparatus is capable of recording the program and if it is the slave starts recording. Furthermore, it would be the slave that has the longest available time because it is the only other device capable of recording.

The Applicant argues that neither Wood et al. nor Blacketter et al. discloses a saving controller for transferring the program data selected by the user as program data to be permanently stored from among the program data stored in said temporary memory to said permanent memory; and partly deleting the program if the program data stored in said temporary memory exceeds said predetermined amount, as recited. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wood et al. discloses in paragraph [0129] pressing the Record button during the live interface state can cause the digital VCR 10 to begin recording the current show.

After pressing the Record button the digital VCR saves the data that has been recorded in the rewind buffer, so that the entire show being viewed on the current channel can be recorded. Furthermore, Wood et al. discloses in paragraph [0059] that the device can use "circular" files to store one or more rewind buffers. Such files are allocated a fixed amount of contiguous disk space upon their creation. Information is written to such a file contiguously starting from the beginning of the allocated block of disk space. When the end of the block is reached, writing resumes at the beginning of the block. Therefore, Wood et al. meets the claimed limitations and the rejection is maintained.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 46 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the same changes made to claim 28 in the previous Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13-23, 25, 27-29, 31-38, 40-42, 46, 47, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0057893).

Regarding claim 1, Wood et al. discloses a system for recording and storing a program broadcast in at least one channel, said system comprising: one or more slave apparatus for setting a program for timer recording when said slave apparatus is instructed to set the program for timer recording, and recording the program at a time when the program set for timer recording is broadcast; and a master apparatus for selecting a slave apparatus to record a program such that a plurality of timer recording settings are not made at one time in one apparatus, when the program to be recorded is determined, and instructing the selected slave apparatus to set the program for timer recording (paragraphs [0030] and [0067]).

Regarding claim 3, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the master apparatus has means for, if instructed to start recording a program without setting timer recording therefor, instructing a slave apparatus which has not recorded programs so far and whose period of time up to the recording start time of a first program set for timer recording is the longest, to start recording the program, and wherein each of said slave apparatus has means for, if instructed to start recording a program, immediately starting to record said program (paragraph [0067]).

Regarding claim 5, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that wherein said master apparatus has means for, if instructed to start recording a program without setting timer recording therefor, rearranging timer recording settings made in the slave apparatus, increasing, as much as possible, a period of time up to the recording start time of a first program set for timer recording in either one of the slave apparatus, instructing the slave apparatus in which timer recording settings are changed to change timer recording settings, and instructing the slave apparatus whose period of time up to the recording start time has been increased as much as possible to start recording the program, and wherein each of said slave apparatus has means for, if instructed to change timer recording settings by said master apparatus, changing timer recording settings, and, if instructed to start recording a program, immediately starting to record said program (paragraph [0067]).

Regarding claim 6, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the master apparatus and each of said slave apparatus are connected to each other via a communication line, each of said slave apparatus has means for indicating a program set for timer recording by the slave apparatus to said master apparatus via said communication line, and said master apparatus has means for instructing the slave apparatus to set the program for timer recording via said communication line (paragraph [0030] – FireWire).

Regarding claim **7**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 1 and 6 including that each of said slave apparatus has means for transmitting a playback signal produced by playing back a program via said communication line to said master apparatus, and said master apparatus has means for outputting the program to an output device for displaying the program when the master apparatus has received the playback signal via said communication line (paragraphs [0030] and [0067]).

Regarding claim **8**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the master apparatus comprises a computer (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim **9**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the slave apparatus comprise respective add-on modules that can be incorporated in said master apparatus (paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device, therefore, the modules of the slave are incorporated in the master).

Regarding claim **10**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the slave apparatus comprise a desired number of software modules that can be executed by said master apparatus (Fig. 2; paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device).

Regarding claim **11**, Wood et al. discloses a system for recording and storing a program broadcast in at least one channel, said system comprising: one

or more slave apparatus for determining whether the slave apparatus are capable of recording a program or not in response to an inquiry as to whether the slave apparatus are capable of recording the program, and, if the slave apparatus are capable of recording the program sending a corresponding response, setting the program for timer recording, and recording the program when a time to broadcast the program is reached; and a master apparatus for, if a program to be recorded is determined, successively asking the slave apparatus about whether the slave apparatus are capable of recording the program until the response indicating that the slave apparatus are capable of recording the program is received, and, if said response is received from a slave apparatus, instructing the slave apparatus which has sent the response to set the program for timer recording (paragraphs [0030] and [0067]).

Regarding claim **13**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 11 including that the master apparatus and each of said slave apparatus are connected to each other via a communication line, and said master apparatus has means for asking the slave apparatus about whether the slave apparatus are capable of recording the program (paragraphs [0030] and [0067] – FireWire).

Regarding claim **14**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 11 and 13 including that the each of said slave apparatus has means for transmitting a playback signal produced by playing back a program via said communication line to said master apparatus, and said

master apparatus has means for outputting the program to an output device for displaying programs when the master apparatus has received the playback signal via said communication line (paragraphs [0030] and [0067]).

Regarding claim **15**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 11, 13, and 14 including that the master apparatus has means for displaying, on said output device, a list of programs stored in said slave apparatus in association with the slave apparatus and times at which the programs have been recorded, for the user to select a program to be played back from the list (paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device; paragraphs [00082] and [0111] - a list is displayed to show the recordings saved on the device).

Regarding claim **16**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claims 11 and 13-15 including that the master apparatus has a function to record and play back said program (Fig. 2; paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device).

Regarding claim **17**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the master apparatus comprises a computer (Fig. 2).

Regarding claim **18**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 11 including that the slave apparatus comprise respective add-on modules that can be incorporated in said master apparatus

(paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device, therefore, the modules of the slave are incorporated in the master).

Regarding claim **19**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 11 including that the slave apparatus comprise a desired number of software modules that can be executed by said master apparatus (Fig. 2; paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device).

Regarding claim **20**, Wood et al. discloses a system for recording and storing a program broadcast on at least one channel, said system comprising: a master apparatus; and one or more slave apparatus; said master apparatus comprising: a first tuner for extracting a signal on an indicated channel from a received broadcast signal; a first encoder for encoding the signal on said channel to generate program data; a first memory for storing said program data; a selector for selecting one of said program data read from said first memory and program data input from another device; a decoder for decoding said program data input from said selector; and a controller for grasping programs set for timer recording in each of all the apparatus, and, if a program to be recorded is determined, selecting an apparatus to record the program such that a plurality of timer recording settings are not made at one time in one apparatus, and, if the master apparatus is selected, extracting a channel on which the program is broadcast with said first tuner when a time to broadcast the program is reached, generating program data of the program with said first encoder, and storing the

program data in said first memory, and, if a slave apparatus other than the master apparatus is selected, instructing the selected slave apparatus to set the program for timer recording, and, if the program data of a program instructed by the user to be played back is stored in said first memory of the master apparatus, reading the program data from said first memory, and decoding the program data with said first decoder, and, if the program data of a program instructed by the user to be played back is stored in a slave apparatus other than the master apparatus, instructing said slave apparatus to play back the program, and decoding the program data input from said slave apparatus with said first decoder; each of said slave apparatus comprising: a second tuner for extracting a signal on an indicated channel from a received broadcast signal; a second encoder for encoding the signal on said channel to generate program data; a second memory for storing said program data; and a controller for extracting a channel on which a program set for timer recording is broadcast with said second tuner when a time to broadcast the program is reached, generating program data of the program with said second encoder, storing the program data in said second memory, reading the program data of a program instructed by said master apparatus to be played back from said second memory, and transmitting the read program data to said master apparatus (Figs. 2 – each device is the same so they both include all the components of Fig. 2; paragraphs [0030] and [0067] – Master and slave both include tuners).

Regarding claim **21**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 20 including that the slave apparatus comprise respective add-on modules that can be incorporated in said master apparatus (paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device, therefore, the modules of the slave are incorporated in the master).

Regarding claim **22**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 20 including that the slave apparatus comprise a desired number of software modules that can be executed by said master apparatus (Fig. 2; paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device).

Regarding claim **23**, Wood et al. discloses an apparatus in a system for recording and storing a program broadcast on at least one channel, said apparatus comprising: a tuner for extracting a signal on an indicated channel from a received broadcast signal; an encoder for encoding the signal on said channel to generate program data; a memory for storing said program data; a decoder for decoding said program data read from said memory; and a controller for grasping programs set for timer recording in a plurality of apparatus including said apparatus itself, and, if a program to be recorded is determined, selecting an apparatus to record the program such that a plurality of timer recording settings are not made at one time in one apparatus, and, if said apparatus itself is selected, extracting a channel on which the program is broadcast with said tuner when a time to broadcast the program is reached, generating program data of

the program with said encoder, and storing the program data in said memory, and, if an apparatus other than said apparatus itself is selected, instructing the selected apparatus to set the program for timer recording, and, if the program data of a program instructed by the user to be played back is stored in said memory of the apparatus itself, reading the program data from said memory, and decoding the program data with said decoder, and, if the program data of a program instructed by the user to be played back is stored in an apparatus other than the apparatus itself, instructing said other apparatus to play back the program, and decoding the program data input from the other apparatus with said decoder (Figs. 2 – each device is the same so they both include all the components of Fig. 2; paragraphs [0030] and [0067] – Master and slave both include tuners).

Regarding claim **25**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 23 including that the controller has means for, if instructed to start recording a program without setting timer recording therefor, instructing an apparatus which has not recorded programs so far and whose period of time up to the recording start time of a first program set for timer recording is the longest, to start recording the program (paragraph [0067]).

Regarding claim **27**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 23 including that the controller has means for, if instructed to start recording a program without setting timer recording therefor, selecting an apparatus which has not recorded programs so far and which has

not made timer recording settings until the end time of a program instructed to start being recorded, and instructing the selected apparatus to start recording the program (paragraph [0067]).

Regarding claim **28**, Wood et al. discloses an apparatus for recording and storing a broadcast program, said apparatus comprising: a temporary memory for temporarily storing up to a predetermined amount of program data; a permanent memory for storing program data selected by the user as program data to be permanently stored from among the program data stored in said temporary memory; a recording controller for successively storing the program data of programs set for timer recording in said temporary memory, and partly deleting the program data recorded in said temporary memory in the past if the program data stored in said temporary memory exceeds said predetermined amount (paragraph [0059]); a saving controller for transferring the program data selected by the user as program data to be permanently stored from among the program data stored in said temporary memory to said permanent memory; and a playback controller for playing back a program selected by the user from the programs whose program data have been stored in said temporary memory and/or said permanent memory (Figs. 2 – each device is the same so they both include all the components of Fig. 2; paragraphs [0030] and [0067] – Master and slave both include tuners; paragraph [0030] – the user sees the two devices as one device; paragraphs [0082] and [0111] – a list is displayed to show the

recordings saved on the device; paragraph [0129] - record a program that has been in the buffer).

Regarding claim **29**, Wood et al. discloses an apparatus according to claim 28, wherein said recording controller has means for displaying a period of time for which the program data stored in said temporary memory are held, on an output device for displaying programs (paragraphs [0059] and [0129]).

Regarding claim **31**, Wood et al. discloses a system for recording a program broadcast on at least one channel, storing program data of the program, and playing back the program when instructed by the user, said system comprising: one or more slave apparatus for automatically continuously recording a program on a predetermined channel and playing back the recorded program as instructed; and a master apparatus for, when the user is to determine a channel on which each of the slave apparatus automatically continuously records a program and to select a program to be played back on the channel, displaying a list of programs recorded by all the slave apparatus in association with channels and times at which the programs are recorded, on an output device for displaying programs, and, if a program to be displayed is selected by the user with a channel and a time, controlling the slave apparatus which has recorded the program to play back the program, and, if the user changes the channel to another channel, controls the slave apparatus which has recorded a program on the other channel at the same time as the former channel to play back the program on the other channel (Figs. 2 – each device is the same so they both

include all the components of Fig. 2; paragraphs [0030] and [0067] – Master and slave both include tuners).

Regarding claim **32**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 31 including that the slave apparatus comprise respective add-on modules that can be incorporated in said master apparatus (paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device, therefore, the modules of the slave are incorporated in the master).

Regarding claim **33**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 31 including that the slave apparatus comprise a desired number of software modules that can be executed by said master apparatus (Fig. 2; paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device).

Regarding claim **34**, Wood et al. discloses a system for recording and storing a program broadcast on at least one channel, said system comprising: a master apparatus; and one or more slave apparatus; said master apparatus comprising: a first memory for storing the program data of recorded programs; a first decoder for decoding program data read from said first memory; and a controller for grasping programs recorded by each of all the apparatus, and, if the program data of a program instructed by the user to be played back is store in the first memory of the master apparatus, reading the program data from said first memory, decoding the program data into a program signal with said first decoder, outputting the program signal to an output device for displaying

programs, and, if the program data of a program instructed by the user to be played back is stored in a slave apparatus, instructing the slave apparatus to play back the program, outputting a program signal received from the slave apparatus to said output device, and, if the program data of a program which is highly likely to be played back by a subsequent control action of the user is stored in the first memory of the master apparatus, preparing the master apparatus to read the program data from said first memory and decode the program data with said first decoder, and, if the program data of a program which is highly likely to be played back by a subsequent control action of the user is stored in a slave apparatus, instructing the slave apparatus to prepare said slave apparatus to play back the program; and each of said slave apparatus comprising: a second memory for storing said program data; a second decoder for decoding the program data read from said second memory into a program signal; and a controller for reading the program data of a program instructed by said master apparatus to be played back from said second memory, decoding the program data into a program signal with said second decoder, transmitting the program signal to said master apparatus, reading the program data of the program instructed to be prepared for playback from said second memory, and preparing said second decoder to decode the program data (Figs. 2 – each device is the same so they both include all the components of Fig. 2; paragraphs [0030] and [0067] – Master and slave both include tuners; paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one

device; paragraphs [0083] and [0111] - a list is displayed to show the recordings saved on the device).

Regarding claim **35**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 34 including that the slave apparatus comprise respective add-on modules that can be incorporated in said master apparatus (paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device, therefore, the modules of the slave are incorporated in the master).

Regarding claim **36**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 34 including that the slave apparatus comprise a desired number of software modules that can be executed by said master apparatus (Fig. 2; paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device).

Regarding claim **37**, Wood et al. discloses an apparatus in a system for recording and storing a program broadcast on at least one channel, said apparatus comprising: a memory for storing the program data of recorded programs; a decoder for decoding program data read from said memory; and a controller for grasping programs recorded by each of all apparatus of the system, and, if the program data of a program instructed by the user to be played back is stored in the memory of the apparatus itself, reading the program data from said memory, decoding the program data into a program signal with said decoder, outputting the program signal to an output device for displaying programs, and, if the program data of a program instructed by the user to be played back is stored

in an apparatus other than said apparatus itself, instructing the other apparatus to play back the program, outputting a program signal received from the other apparatus to said output device, and, if the program data of a program which is highly likely to be played back by a subsequent control action of the user is stored in the memory of said apparatus itself, preparing the apparatus itself to read the program data from said memory and decode the program data with said decoder, and, if the program data of a program which is highly likely to be played back by a subsequent control action of the user is stored in an apparatus other than the apparatus itself, instructing the other apparatus to prepare said other apparatus to play back the program (Figs. 2 – each device is the same so they both include all the components of Fig. 2; paragraphs [0030] and [0067] – Master and slave both include tuners; paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device; paragraphs [00082] and [0111] - a list is displayed to show the recordings saved on the device).

Regarding claim 38, Wood et al. discloses an apparatus for controlling a plurality of broadcast recording apparatus each for, if instructed to set a program for timer recording, setting the program for timer recording, and recording the program when a time to broadcast the program set for timer recording is reached, said apparatus comprising: means for selecting one of the broadcast recording apparatus to record the program such that a plurality of timer recording settings are not made at one time in one apparatus; and means for instructing the selected broadcast recording apparatus to set the program for timer

recording (Figs. 2 – each device is the same so they both include all the components of Fig. 2; paragraphs [0030] and [0067] – Master and slave both include tuners; paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device; paragraphs [00082] and [0111] - a list is displayed to show the recordings saved on the device).

Regarding claim **40**, Wood et al. discloses a system for recording and storing a plurality of units of data from data broadcast in units selected by a single tuner, said system comprising: one or more slave apparatus for, if instructed to set a unit of data for timer recording, setting the data for timer recording, and recording the data when a time to broadcast the data is reached; and a master apparatus for grasping data set for timer recording by said slave apparatus, and, if data to be recorded is determined, selecting one of the slave apparatus such that a plurality of timer recording settings are not made at one time in one apparatus, an instructing the selected slave apparatus to set the data for timer recording (Figs. 2 – each device is the same so they both include all the components of Fig. 2; paragraphs [0030] and [0067] – Master and slave both include tuners; paragraph [0030] - the user sees the two devices as one device; paragraphs [00082] and [0111] - a list is displayed to show the recordings saved on the device).

Regarding claim **41**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 40 including that each of said units comprises a

transport stream (paragraph [0030] – a transport stream is needed in order to go through the FireWire).

Regarding claims **42, 46, 47, and 49**, these are computer program claims corresponding to the system and apparatus claims 1, 11, 20, 23, 28, 31, 34, 37, 38, and 40. Therefore, claims 42, 46, 47, and 49 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 1, 11, 20, 23, 28, 31, 34, 37, 38, and 40.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Tanaka (U.S. Patent 7,072,576).

Regarding claim **30**, Wood et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 28, but fails to disclose that the apparatus further comprises means for allowing the user to set memory capacities to said temporary memory and said permanent memory.

Referring to the Tanaka reference, Tanaka discloses apparatus comprising means for allowing the user to set memory capacities to said temporary memory and said permanent memory (Fig. 2; col. 6, lines 58-67 – if

the temporary memory capacity is changed then the permanent memory is changed as can be seen from Fig. 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have allowed the user to change the capacities of the temporary and permanent as taught by Tanaka in the apparatus disclosed by Wood et al. in order to allow the user to change the memories to accommodate one's own viewing styles, if the user records more then they would want less of a temporary memory and more of a permanent memory.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 2, 4, 12, 24, 26, and 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
8. Claims 43 and 50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Prior art fails to teach or fairly suggest a system for reading and storing a program broadcast in at least once channel, the system comprising: wherein the master apparatus has means for, if a slave apparatus to record a program cannot be selected, rearranging timer recording settings made in the slave apparatus to retain a slave apparatus to record a program, instructing the retained slave apparatus to change timer

recording settings and set the program for timer recording, and instructing other slave apparatus in which timer recording settings are changed to change timer recording settings, and wherein each of said slave apparatus has means for, if instructed to change timer recording settings by said master apparatus, changing timer recording settings.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HEATHER R. JONES whose telephone number is (571)272-7368. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am - 4:30 pm, and every other Fri.: 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 2621

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Heather R Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 2621

HRJ
December 18, 2008

/Thai Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621